arXiv:1601.02480v1 [quant-ph] 11 Jan 2016

Quantum probability and quantum decision making

V.I. Yukalov[1,2,*] and D. Sornette[1,3]

[1] *Department of Management, Technology and Economics, ETH Zürich (Swiss Federal Institute of Technology) Scheuchzerstrasse 7, Zürich CH-8032, Switzerland*

[2] *Bogolubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna 141980, Russia*

[3] *Swiss Finance Institute, c/o University of Geneva, 40 blvd. Du Pont d'Arve, CH 1211 Geneva 4, Switzerland*

Abstract

A rigorous general definition of quantum probability is given, which is valid for elementary events and for composite events, for operationally testable measurements as well as for inconclusive measurements, and also for non-commuting observables in addition to commutative observables. Our proposed definition of quantum probability makes it possible to describe quantum measurements and quantum decision making on the same common mathematical footing. Conditions are formulated for the case when quantum decision theory reduces to its classical counterpart and for the situation where the use of quantum decision theory is necessary.

Keywords: quantum probability, quantum measurements, quantum decision making

Authors for correspondence: V. I. Yukalov
E-mail: yukalov@theor.jinr.ru

1 Introduction

A general and mathematically correct definition of quantum probability is necessary for several important applications: theory of quantum measurements, theory of quantum information processing and quantum computing, quantum decision theory, and creation of artificial quantum intelligence. Although the definition of quantum probability for operationally testable events is well known and used from the beginning of quantum theory [1], such a definition for composite events, corresponding to noncommuting observables, has been a long-standing problem. This problem becomes especially important in the application of the quantum approach to psychological and cognitive sciences, where there exist not only operationally testable events, but also decisions under uncertainty, corresponding to operationally uncertain events. Moreover, for decision making in real-life, decisions under uncertainty are not exceptions, but rather are common typical situations.

Classical decision theory, based on the notion of utility [2], is known to yield numerous paradoxes in realistic decision making [3]. This is why a variety of quantum models has been suggested for applications in psychological and cognitive sciences, as can be inferred from books [4–7] and reviews [8–10].

Applying quantum theory to psychological and cognitive sciences, researchers have often constructed special models designed specifically to treat particular cases of decision making. However, to our firm understanding, the theory of quantum decision making has to be formulated as a general theory valid for arbitrary cases. Moreover, such a theory should have the same mathematical grounds as the theory of quantum measurements. Really, the latter can be interpreted as decision theory [1]. Between measurements and decisions, there is a direct correspondence requiring just a slight language change: measurements correspond to events; operationally testable measurements are analogous to certain events; undefined measurements can be matched to uncertain events; composite measurements are equivalent to composite decisions.

The aim of this paper is to present a general theory, with a unique well-defined mathematical basis, which would be valid for both quantum measurements as well as for quantum decision making. The main point of such an approach lies in a correct definition of quantum probability that would be applicable for any type of measurements and events, operationally testable or inconclusive, elementary or composite, corresponding to commuting or noncommuting observables. The theory has to be valid for closed as well as for open systems, for individual as well as for social decision makers. Also, it has to be more general than classical theory, including the latter as a particular case and clearly distinguishing the conditions necessarily requiring the use of quantum techniques and those when the classical approach is sufficient. Finally, it should not be just a descriptive way of modeling, but it must allow for quantitative predictions.

2 Main preliminary notions

2.1 Quantum-classical correspondence principle

In order to constrain and anchor the general quantum theory, we require the validity of the *quantum-classical correspondence principle*. This principle was put forward by Bohr [11, 12] for a particular case related to atomic spectra. Later its applicability was extended to other problems of quantum mechanics, with the Ehrenfest equations being one of the illustrations [13]. Nowadays, this principle is understood in the generalized sense as the requirement that classical theory be a particular case of quantum theory [14]. In the present context, it implies that the theory

of quantum measurements should include the theory of classical measurements, that quantum decision theory should include classical decision theory, and that classical probability should be a particular case of quantum probability.

In what follows, we use the term *event*, implying that this can be an event in decision theory or probability theory, or the result of a measurement in the quantum theory of measurements.

2.2 Quantum logic of events

The algebra of events is prescribed by quantum logic [15]. Events form an event ring $\mathcal{R} = \{A_i : i = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ possessing two binary operations, addition and conjunction. Addition is such that for any $A, B \in \mathcal{R}$, there exists $A \cup B \in \mathcal{R}$ with the properties:

$$A \cup B = B \cup A \qquad (commutativity) \; ,$$

$$A \cup (B \cup C) = (A \cup B) \cup C \qquad (associativity) \; ,$$

$$A \cup A = A \qquad (idempotency) \; .$$

Conjunction means that for any $A, B \in \mathcal{R}$, there exists $A \cap B \in \mathcal{R}$ satisfying the properties:

$$(A \cap B) \cap C = A \cap (B \cap C) \qquad (associativity)$$

$$A \cap A = A \qquad (idempotency) \; .$$

But, generally, conjunction is not commutative and not distributive:

$$A \cap B \neq B \cap A \qquad (no\ commutativity) \; ,$$

$$A \cap (B \cup C) \neq (A \cap B) \cup A \cap C \qquad (no\ distributivity) \; .$$

The fact that distributivity is absent in quantum logic was emphasized by Birkhoff and von Neumann [15], who illustrated this by the following example. Suppose there are two events B_1 and B_2 that, when combined, form unity, $B_1 \cup B_2 = 1$. Moreover, B_1 and B_2 are such that each of them is orthogonal to a nontrivial event $A \neq 0$, hence $A \cap B_1 = A \cap B_2 = 0$. According to this definition, $A \cap (B_1 \cup B_2) = A \cap 1 = A$. But if the property of distributivity were true, then one would get $(A \cap B_1) \cup (A \cap B_2) = 0$. This implies that $A = 0$, which contradicts the assumption that $A \neq 0$.

It is easy to illustrate the concept of non-distributivity in quantum physics by numerous examples. The simplest of these is as follows [16]. Let us measure the spin projection of a particle with spin 1/2. Let B_1 be the event of measuring the spin in the up state with respect to the axis z, while B_2 is the event of measuring the spin in the down state along this axis. Since the spin can be either up or down, $B_1 \cup B_2 = 1$. And let A be the event of measuring the spin along an axis in the plane orthogonal to the axis z. According to the rules of quantum mechanics, the spin cannot be measured simultaneously along two orthogonal axes, it is found either measured along one axis or along another axis but cannot have components on both axes at the same time. Hence $A \cap B_1 = A \cap B_2 = 0$, while $A \cap (B_1 \cup B_2) \neq 0$. Therefore, there is no distributivity of events in the spin measurement.

Thus the non-distributivity of events is an important concept that should not be forgotten in applying quantum theory to cognitive sciences.

2.3 Decision maker state

In quantum theory, systems can be closed or open. Respectively, their states can be described by wave functions or as statistical operators. How should one interpret the state of a decision maker, as a wave function or as a statistical operator? Such a state, characterizing the given decision maker, can be called a *strategic decision-maker state* [17–19].

Recall the notion of an isolated system in quantum theory. Strictly speaking, quantum systems cannot be absolutely isolated, but can only be *quasi-isolated* [20, 21], which means the following. At initial time $t = 0$, one can prepare a system in a pure state described by a wave function. However, there always exist uncontrollable external perturbations or noise from the surrounding, resulting in the system decoherence beyond a time t_{dec}, which makes the system state mixed. Also, to confirm that the considered system is to some extent isolated, it is necessary to check this by additional control measurements starting at time t_{con}, which again disturbs the system's isolation. In this way, one can assume that the system is quasi-isolated during the interval of time $0 < t < min\{t_{dec}, t_{con}\}$.

Decision makers, generally, are the members of a society, hence, they correspond to non-isolated open systems that have to be described by statistical operators. One could think that in laboratory tests, it would be admissible to treat decision makers as closed systems and to characterize them by wave functions. This, however, is not correct. First of all, in laboratory tests, even when being separated from each other, decision makers do communicate with the investigators performing the test. Moreover, even when being for some time locked in a separate room, any decision maker possesses the memory of interacting with many people before as well as his/her expectations of future interactions, which influences his/her decisions. From the physiological point of view, *memory is nothing but delayed interactions*. Therefore, no decision maker can be treated as an isolated system, which excludes the validity of using a wave function description. The correct treatment of any decision maker requires to consider him/her as an open system, hence, characterized by a statistical operator.

2.4 Operationally testable events

In the theory of quantum measurements or quantum decision theory, the simplest case occurs when one deals with a simple event corresponding to a single measurement, or a single action. Observable quantities in quantum theory are represented by self-adjoint operators, say $\hat{A}$, from the algebra of local observables. Measuring an eigenvalue A_n of the operator can be interpreted as the occurrence of an event A_n. The corresponding eigenvector $|n\rangle$ is termed a microstate in physics, or event mode in decision theory. Here and in what follows, the family of eigenvectors is assumed to be orthonormalized. Respectively, the operator $\hat{P}_n \equiv |n\rangle\langle n|$ is a measurement projector in physics, or an event operator in decision theory. The collection $\{\hat{P}_n\}$ is a projector-valued measure.

The space of microstates, or the space of decision modes, is given by the Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{H}_A = \mathrm{span}\{|n\rangle\} \; . \tag{1}$$

The considered quantum system state, or decision maker strategic state, is characterized by a statistical operator $\hat{\rho}$. The pair $\{\mathcal{H}, \hat{\rho}\}$ is a statistical ensemble, or decision ensemble. The probability of measuring an eigenvalue A_n, or the probability of an event A_n, is given by the formula

$$p(A_n) = \mathrm{Tr}_A \hat{\rho}\hat{P}_n \equiv \langle \hat{P}_n \rangle \; , \tag{2}$$

where the trace operation is over space (1). This probability is uniquely defined for any Hilbert space (1) of dimensionality larger than two [22].

2.5 Problem of degenerate spectrum

The spectrum of the considered operator can happen to be degenerate, which implies that a single eigenvalue A_n corresponds to several eigenvectors $|n_j\rangle$, with $j = 1, 2, \ldots$. Does this create any problem?

This is not a problem in quantum measurements. In the case of degeneracy, one introduces a projector

$$\hat{P}_n \equiv \sum_j \hat{P}_{n_j} \qquad \left(\hat{P}_{n_j} = |n_j\rangle\langle n_j| \right) \; , \tag{3}$$

so that the probability of measuring A_n becomes

$$p(A_n) = \mathrm{Tr}_A \hat{\rho} \hat{P}_n = \sum_j \langle \hat{P}_{n_j} \rangle \; . \tag{4}$$

Degeneracy may seem to be an annoyance in decision theory. Really, if A_n is a degenerate event related to a degenerate spectrum, then what would be the meaning of the different modes associated with the same event? It is necessary to ascribe some meaning to these different modes, otherwise the situation will be ambiguous.

Fortunately, the problem of degeneracy is easily avoidable, both in physics as well as in decision theory. In physics, degeneracy can be lifted by switching on arbitrarily weak external fields. In decision theory, this would correspond to reclassifying the events by adding small differences between the events. Mathematically, the procedure of lifting degeneracy is done by adding to the considered operator of an observable an infinitesimally small term breaking the symmetry that caused the degeneracy, which means the replacement

$$\hat{A} \rightarrow \hat{A} + \nu \hat{\Gamma} \qquad (\nu \rightarrow 0) \; . \tag{5}$$

The related eigenvalues $A_{n_j} + \nu \Gamma_{n_j}$ become nondegenerate. Then the probability of each subevent can be defined as

$$p(A_{n_j}) = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow 0} p\left(A_{n_j} + \nu \Gamma_{n_j} \right) \; . \tag{6}$$

Such a procedure of degeneracy lifting was mentioned by von Neumann [1] for quantum systems and developed as the method of quasi-averages by Bogolubov [23, 24] for statistical systems.

In any case, neither in physics nor in decision theory, the problem of spectrum degeneracy is actually a principal problem. One just needs to either ascribe a meaning to different modes of an event, or one can avoid the problem completely by lifting the degeneracy, which corresponds to a reclassification of events, as already mentioned. The latter way is preferable in decision theory, since it avoids the ambiguity in dealing with unspecified degeneracy.

2.6 Consecutive quantum measurements

In quantum theory, one considers the possibility of measuring two observables immediately one after the other. The standard treatment of this process is as follows. Suppose, first, one accomplishes a measurement for an observable represented by an operator $\hat{B}$, with eigenvalues B_α and

eigenvectors $|\alpha\rangle$. The event B_α is represented by the projector $\hat{P}_\alpha \equiv |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|$. One assumes that, immediately after measuring B_α, the system state reduces from $\hat{\rho}$ to the state

$$\hat{\rho}_\alpha \equiv \frac{\hat{P}_\alpha \hat{\rho} \hat{P}_\alpha}{\mathrm{Tr}\hat{\rho}\hat{P}_\alpha} \; . \tag{7}$$

Immediately after the first measurement, one accomplishes a measurement for an observable represented by an operator $\hat{A}$, with eigenvalues A_n and eigenvectors $|n\rangle$. The event A_n is represented by the projector $\hat{P}_n \equiv |n\rangle\langle n|$.

The probability of these consecutive measurements is the Lüders [25] probability

$$p_L(A_n|B_\alpha) \equiv \mathrm{Tr}\hat{\rho}_\alpha \hat{P}_n = \frac{\mathrm{Tr}\hat{\rho}\hat{P}_\alpha \hat{P}_n \hat{P}_\alpha}{\mathrm{Tr}\hat{\rho}\hat{P}_\alpha} \; , \tag{8}$$

also called von Neumann-Lüders probability.

By introducing the Wigner [26] probability

$$p_W(A_n|B_\alpha) \equiv \mathrm{Tr}\hat{\rho}\hat{P}_\alpha \hat{P}_n \hat{P}_\alpha \; , \tag{9}$$

one comes to the relation

$$p_W(A_n|B_\alpha) = p_L(A_n|B_\alpha) p(B_\alpha) \; . \tag{10}$$

This formula is reminiscent of the relation between the joint probability of two events and the conditional probability for these events. Because of this similarity, one interprets the Wigner probability p_W as a joint probability and the Lüders probability p_L as a conditional probability.

However, by direct calculations, assuming nondegenerate events, we have

$$p_L(A_n|B_\alpha) = |\langle n|\alpha\rangle|^2 \; . \tag{11}$$

This form is symmetric with respect to the interchange of events. Therefore the Lüders probability cannot be treated as the generalization of the classical conditional probability that is not necessarily symmetric. Respectively, the Wigner probability cannot be considered as a joint probability of two events [27].

One could think that, by invoking degenerate events, it would be possible to avoid the problem. Suppose the events A_n and B_α are degenerate, so that their projectors are

$$\hat{P}_n = \sum_i \hat{P}_{n_i} \; , \qquad \hat{P}_\alpha = \sum_j \hat{P}_{\alpha_j} \; . \tag{12}$$

Then we have

$$p_W(A_n|B_\alpha) = \sum_{ijk} \langle \alpha_i|\hat{\rho}|\alpha_j\rangle\langle\alpha_j|n_k\rangle\langle n_k|\alpha_i\rangle \; , \qquad p(B_\alpha) = \sum_j \langle\alpha_j|\hat{\rho}|\alpha_j\rangle \; . \tag{13}$$

Interchanging the events yields

$$p_W(B_\alpha|A_n) = \sum_{ijk} \langle n_i|\hat{\rho}|n_j\rangle\langle n_j|\alpha_k\rangle\langle\alpha_k|n_i\rangle \; , \qquad p(A_n) = \sum_j \langle n_j|\hat{\rho}|n_j\rangle \; . \tag{14}$$

This shows that the Lüders probability, generally, is not symmetric for degenerate events.

But let us remember the quantum-classical correspondence principle, according to which classical theory has to be a particular case of quantum theory. In classical theory, the field of events is commutative. In quantum theory, commuting observables share the same family of eigenvectors. This can be formulated as the property $\langle \alpha_i | n_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}\delta_{\alpha\beta}$. Then, passing to commutative events, for the Lüders probability (8) we obtain

$$p_L(A_n|B_\alpha) = \delta_{n\alpha} = p_L(B_\alpha|A_n) \; . \tag{15}$$

This is not merely symmetric, but even trivial. Contrary to this, classical conditional probabilities are neither symmetric nor trivial.

Thus, the quantum-classical correspondence principle does not hold, which means that the Lüders probability in no way should be accepted as a generalization of classical conditional probability. The Lüders probability is just a transition probability. If one wishes, one can use it as a transition probability in the frame of a narrow class of physical measurements. However, it is not a conditional probability in the general sense, and its use as such for cognitive sciences is not correct [27–29].

It is worth mentioning that the Kirkwood [30] form $\langle \hat{P}_n \hat{P}_\alpha \rangle = \mathrm{Tr}\hat{\rho}\hat{P}_n\hat{P}_\alpha$ also cannot be accepted as a probability, since it is complex-valued.

Concluding this section, we stress that the standard von Neumann-Lüders transition probability cannot be treated as a generalization of classical conditional probability to the quantum region, since it does not satisfy the quantum-classical correspondence principle. And the consideration of degenerate events does not save the situation.

2.7 Realistic measurement procedure

The problem with the von Neumann-Lüders probability lies in its oversimplified nature, giving only a cartoon of the much more complicated procedure of realistic measurements. This cartoon ignores the existence and influence of a measuring device, it ignores the finite time of any measurement, and it ignores that during measurements and between them, the system evolves. The correct description of a realistic measurement procedure is as follows [27].

Let us assume that we are interested in measuring two observables corresponding to the operators $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$, with eigenvalues A_n and B_α and eigenvectors $|n\rangle$ and $|\alpha\rangle$, respectively. The related event representations are

$$A_n \rightarrow |n\rangle \rightarrow \hat{P}_n = |n\rangle\langle n| \; , \qquad B_\alpha \rightarrow |\alpha\rangle \rightarrow \hat{P}_\alpha = |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha| \; . \tag{16}$$

According to Eq. (1), the corresponding mode spaces are

$$\mathcal{H}_A \equiv \mathrm{span}\{|n\rangle\} \; , \qquad \mathcal{H}_B \equiv \mathrm{span}\{|\alpha\rangle\} \; . \tag{17}$$

To measure anything, one needs a measuring device, whose internal states are the vectors of a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_M$. In decision theory, this state corresponds to internal states of a decision maker. The total space, containing all possible microstates, is the tensor-product space

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \bigotimes \mathcal{H}_B \bigotimes \mathcal{H}_M \; . \tag{18}$$

The measurement procedure consists of several channels. The first step of any measurement is the preparation of the device for measurement, which can be represented by the entangling channel

$$C_1 : \; \hat{\rho}_A(0) \bigotimes \hat{\rho}_B(0) \bigotimes \hat{\rho}_M(0) \rightarrow \hat{\rho}(t_1) \; , \tag{19}$$

describing the formation from initial partial states, during the preparation time t_1, of an entangled total state $\hat{\varrho}(t_1)$ of the system plus the measuring device.

Before the measurement starts, the total state evolves until time t_2, according to the channel

$$C_2 : \ \hat{\rho}(t_1) \rightarrow \hat{\rho}(t_2) \ , \tag{20}$$

where

$$\hat{\rho}(t_2) = \hat{U}(t_2 - t_1)\hat{\rho}(t_1)\hat{U}^{+}(t_2 - t_1) \ ,$$

with $\hat{U}$ being the evolution operator.

In the interval of time $[t_2, t_3]$, one measures the observable corresponding to the operator $\hat{B}$, which is described by the partially disentangling channel

$$C_3 : \ \hat{\rho}(t_2) \rightarrow \hat{\rho}_{AM}(t_3) \bigotimes \hat{\rho}_B(t_3) \ , \tag{21}$$

where

$$\hat{\rho}_{AM}(t_3) = \mathrm{Tr}_B \hat{\rho}(t_3) \ , \qquad \hat{\rho}_B(t_3) = \mathrm{Tr}_{AM} \hat{\rho}(t_3) \ .$$

Disentangling, or separating $\hat{\rho}_B(t_3)$ from the total state is necessary for measuring the values related to the operator of the observable $\hat{B}$. According to the standard definition, separating a subsystem implies tracing out all other degrees of freedom, except those of the considered subsystem.

Then, until time t_4, the system again is getting entangled by the evolution channel

$$C_4 : \ \hat{\rho}_{AM}(t_3) \bigotimes \hat{\rho}_B(t_3) \rightarrow \hat{\rho}(t_4) \ , \tag{22}$$

where

$$\hat{\rho}(t_4) = \hat{U}(t_4 - t_3)\hat{\rho}_{AM}(t_3) \bigotimes \hat{\rho}_B(t_3)\hat{U}^{+}(t_4 - t_3) \ .$$

Finally, in the interval of time $[t_4, t_5]$, one accomplishes a measurement of the observable associated with the operator $\hat{A}$, which is characterized by the partially disentangling channel

$$C_5 : \ \hat{\rho}(t_4) \rightarrow \hat{\rho}_A(t_5) \bigotimes \hat{\rho}_{BM}(t_5) \ , \tag{23}$$

where

$$\hat{\rho}_A(t_5) = \mathrm{Tr}_{BM} \hat{\rho}(t_5) \ , \qquad \hat{\rho}_{BM}(t_5) = \mathrm{Tr}_A \hat{\rho}(t_5) \ .$$

Summarizing, the process of measurement of two observables is a procedure represented by the channel convolution

$$C = C_5 \bigotimes C_4 \bigotimes C_3 \bigotimes C_2 \bigotimes C_1 \tag{24}$$

and consisting of five steps:

$$\begin{array}{lll} C_1 : & preparation, & t \in [0, t_1] \ , \\ C_2 : & evolution, & t \in [t_1, t_2] \ , \\ C_3 : & B - measurement, & t \in [t_2, t_3] \ , \\ C_4 : & evolution, & t \in [t_3, t_4] \ , \\ C_5 : & A - measurement, & t \in [t_4, t_5] \ . \end{array} \tag{25}$$

The evolution channels are unitary but entangling, while the measurement channels are disentangling but nonunitary. The measurement channels are nonunitary because they involve the trace operation that cannot be represented by a unitary operator. The realistic measurement procedure is more complicated than the von Neumann-Lüders scheme and, generally, cannot be reduced to the latter even if the involved intervals of time are rather short.

3 Joint quantum probability

3.1 Channel-state duality

As is explained in Sec. 2.f, the von Neumann-Lüders scheme does not provide a general definition of conditional quantum probabilities and therefore does not lead to correct joint quantum probabilities. This is due to the fact that a realistic measurement procedure requires the five-step convolution channels described in the previous section. This multichannel measurement procedure looks quite complicated. Fortunately, there exists the Choi-Jamiolkowski [31, 32] isomorphism establishing the channel-state duality

$$C \longleftrightarrow \{\hat{\rho}_{AB},\ \mathcal{H}_{AB}\} \ , \tag{26}$$

with a state $\hat{\rho}_{AB}$ defined on the Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{H}_{AB} = \mathcal{H}_A \bigotimes \mathcal{H}_B \ . \tag{27}$$

Thus, instead of dealing with the channel convolution, we can equivalently consider the composite state characterized by the space of microstates (27).

3.2 Prospects as composite events

Using the channel-state duality, we can interpret the measurement of two observables, or the occurrence of two events, as a composite event. For instance, let us consider events A and B. The corresponding composite event, called *prospect*, is $A \bigotimes B$, which is represented by the tensor product of two event operators as

$$A \bigotimes B \rightarrow \hat{P}_A \bigotimes \hat{P}_B \ , \tag{28}$$

with the event operators $\hat{P}_A = |A\rangle\langle A|,\ \hat{P}_B = |B\rangle\langle B|$.

The joint probability of the prospect composed of two events is

$$p\left(A \bigotimes B\right) = \mathrm{Tr}_{AB}\hat{\rho}_{AB}\hat{P}_A \bigotimes \hat{P}_B \ . \tag{29}$$

This definition has been employed from the beginning of the development of our approach named Quantum Decision Theory (QDT) [8, 17–19, 33, 34]. We use the term *prospect* for a composite event, since when applying the QDT to decision making, we calculate the classical part of the quantum probability by invoking the notion of utility [33–35].

3.3 Conditional quantum probabilities

Having defined the joint probability of events, it is straightforward to introduce the conditional probabilities

$$p(A|B) \equiv \frac{p(A \bigotimes B)}{p(B)} \ , \qquad p(B|A) \equiv \frac{p(B \bigotimes A)}{p(A)} \ , \tag{30}$$

with the marginal probabilities

$$p(A) = \mathrm{Tr}_{AB}\hat{\rho}_{AB}\hat{P}_A \bigotimes \hat{1}_B \ , \qquad p(B) = \mathrm{Tr}_{AB}\hat{\rho}_{AB}\hat{1}_A \bigotimes \hat{P}_B \ . \tag{31}$$

Here $\hat{1}_A$ and $\hat{1}_B$ are unity operators in the corresponding spaces. Clearly, the conditional probabilities, in general, are not symmetric.

Note that this definition of conditional probabilities is self-consistent and does not meet the problem of connecting conditional and joint probabilities, as in the case when conditional probabilities are defined through the Lüders form [36].

3.4 Separable and entangled prospects

The property of entanglement is important for both quantum measurements as well as for quantum decision making [37,38]. There are two types of prospects that qualitatively differ from each other, separable and entangled, whose rigorous definition is given below.

Let $\mathcal{A} = \{\hat{A}\}$ be an algebra of local observables defined on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$. For any two operators $\hat{A}_1$ and $\hat{A}_2$ from $\mathcal{A}$, it is possible to introduce the scalar product $\sigma_A : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by the rule

$$\sigma_A : \left(\hat{A}_1, \ \hat{A}_2 \right) = \mathrm{Tr}_A \hat{A}_1^+ \hat{A}_2 . \tag{32}$$

This scalar product generates the Hilbert-Schmidt norm $||\hat{A}|| \equiv \sqrt{\left(\hat{A}_1, \ \hat{A}_2 \right)}$. The triple of the algebra of observables $\mathcal{A}$, acting on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$, and the above scalar product σ_A compose a Hilbert-Schmidt space

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{A}} \equiv \{ \mathcal{A}, \ \mathcal{H}_A, \ \sigma_A \} . \tag{33}$$

Let us introduce a composite Hilbert-Schmidt space by the tensor-product space

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{A}} \bigotimes \widetilde{\mathcal{B}} = \{ \mathcal{A}, \ \mathcal{H}_A, \ \sigma_A \} \bigotimes \{ \mathcal{B}, \ \mathcal{H}_B, \ \sigma_B \} . \tag{34}$$

An operator $\hat{C}$ in space (34) is called separable if and only if

$$\hat{C} = \sum_i \hat{A}_i \bigotimes \hat{B}_i \qquad (\hat{A}_i \in \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}, \ \hat{B}_i \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}) , \tag{35}$$

while it is entangled if and only if it cannot be represented in the separable form:

$$\hat{C} \neq \sum_i \hat{A}_i \bigotimes \hat{B}_i \qquad (\hat{A}_i \in \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}, \ \hat{B}_i \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}) . \tag{36}$$

Prospects, being composite events, are represented, in view of Eq. (28), by composite event operators. The structure of the prospect operators depends on how a composite Hilbert-Schmidt space is defined. Generally, the prospect operators can be separable or entangled. Then the related prospects can also be termed separable or entangled.

It is easy to give an example of a separable prospect. Let the algebras $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be composed of the corresponding projectors $\hat{P}_n$ and $\hat{P}_\alpha$. The prospect $A_n \bigotimes B_\alpha$, is represented by the relation

$$A_n \bigotimes B_\alpha \rightarrow \hat{P} \left(A_n \bigotimes B_\alpha \right) = \hat{P}_n \bigotimes \hat{P}_\alpha . \tag{37}$$

Here the prospect operator is clearly separable. Hence the prospect $A_n \bigotimes B_\alpha$ is called separable. Its probability is

$$p \left(A_n \bigotimes B_\alpha \right) = \mathrm{Tr}_{AB} \hat{\rho}_{AB} \hat{P}_n \bigotimes \hat{P}_\alpha = \langle n\alpha | \hat{\rho}_{AB} | n\alpha \rangle . \tag{38}$$

In contrast, entangled prospects appear when measurements or decision making are accomplished under uncertainty.

3.5 Measurements and decisions under uncertainty

An inconclusive event is a set $B = \{B_\alpha : \alpha = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ that is represented by a vector $|B\rangle$ of a Hilbert space, such that

$$B \to |B\rangle = \sum_\alpha b_\alpha |\alpha\rangle \; , \tag{39}$$

with the event operator

$$\hat{P}_B = |B\rangle\langle B| = \sum_{\alpha\beta} b_\alpha b_\beta^* |\alpha\rangle\langle\beta| \; . \tag{40}$$

In quantum measurements, an inconclusive event implies that after a measurement there is no a single measured value, but the result is a set of possible data B_α weighted with $|b_\alpha|^2$. In that sense, it is not a certain operationally testable event. In decision making, an inconclusive decision means that an exact decision is not yet actually taken, but it rather describes the process of deliberation between several possibilities, in that sense being an incomplete decision.

Let us emphasize that an inconclusive event is not a union. Because an inconclusive event is represented as

$$B \to \hat{P}_B = \sum_\alpha |b_\alpha|^2 \hat{P}_\alpha + \sum_{\alpha\neq\beta} b_\alpha b_\beta^* |\alpha\rangle\langle\beta| \; , \tag{41}$$

while a union is represented by the relation

$$\cup_\alpha \, B_\alpha \to \sum_\alpha \hat{P}_\alpha \; . \tag{42}$$

Therefore, the corresponding event operators are very different.

One may say that an inconclusive event, being not uniquely operationally testable, cannot be the final stage of a measurement or decision making. But inconclusive events can occur, and often do exist, at intermediate stages of measurements and decisions. Actually, this is a typical situation for decisions under uncertainty. There are many such illustrations in the processes of physical measurement [27, 38, 39] as well as in decision making [8, 19, 33, 34].

A typical prospect, describing a measurement or decision under uncertainty, has the form

$$\pi_n = A_n \bigotimes B \; , \tag{43}$$

where the final event A_n is operationally testable, and $B = \{B_\alpha\}$ is an intermediate inconclusive event. This prospect is represented by the prospect state according to the relation

$$\pi_n \to |\pi_n\rangle = |n\rangle \bigotimes |B\rangle \tag{44}$$

and induces the related prospect operator,

$$\pi_n \to \hat{P}(\pi_n) = |\pi_n\rangle\langle\pi_n| = \hat{P}_n \bigotimes \hat{P}_B \; . \tag{45}$$

The explicit form of the latter is

$$\hat{P}(\pi_n) = \sum_{\alpha\beta} b_\alpha b_\beta^* \hat{P}_n \bigotimes |\alpha\rangle\langle\beta| \; . \tag{46}$$

The prospect states $|\pi_n\rangle$ are not necessarily orthonormalized. Therefore a prospect operator, generally, is not idempotent, since

$$\hat{P}^2(\pi_n) = \langle\pi_n|\pi_n\rangle \; \hat{P}(\pi_n) \; , \tag{47}$$

hence, it is not a projector. But the resolution of unity is required:

$$\sum_n \hat{P}(\pi_n) = \hat{1} \; , \tag{48}$$

where $\hat{1}$ is a unity operator in space (27). The family of the prospect operators $\{\hat{P}(\pi_n)\}$ forms a positive operator-valued measure [27, 40].

The projectors $\hat{P}_n$ and $\hat{P}_\alpha$ represent operationally testable events. Because of this, the algebras of observables are defined as the collections of these projectors. Thus, we have two algebras of observables

$$\mathcal{A} = \{\hat{P}_n\} \; , \qquad \mathcal{B} = \{\hat{P}_\alpha\} \tag{49}$$

acting on the Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$, respectively. With these algebras of observables in mind, we construct the Hilbert-Schmidt space (34). Then, analyzing the prospect operator (46), which can be written as

$$\hat{P}(\pi_n) = \sum_\alpha |b_\alpha|^2 \hat{P}_n \bigotimes \hat{P}_\alpha + \sum_{\alpha\neq\beta} b_\alpha b_\beta^* \hat{P}_n \bigotimes |\alpha\rangle\langle\beta| \; , \tag{50}$$

we see that this operator is entangled, since, although the first term is separable, but the second term here is entangled. That is, prospect (43) is also called entangled.

4 Probability of uncertain prospects

Suppose we consider several prospects forming a lattice

$$\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_n : \; n = 1, 2, \ldots, N\} \; . \tag{51}$$

The probability of a prospect is given by the quantum form

$$p(\pi_n) = \mathrm{Tr}_{AB} \hat{\rho}_{AB} \hat{P}(\pi_n) \; . \tag{52}$$

By construction, the probability is non-negative and normalized,

$$\sum_n p(\pi_n) = 1 \; , \qquad 0 \leq p(\pi_n) \leq 1 \; , \tag{53}$$

so that the family $\{p(\pi_n)\}$ is a probability measure.

With the prospect operator (50), it is straightforward to see that the prospect probability can be written as a sum of two terms,

$$p(\pi_n) = f(\pi_n) + q(\pi_n) \; . \tag{54}$$

The first term $f(\pi_n)$ contains the diagonal part of Eq. (50). It describes the objective utility of the prospect, because of which it is called the *utility factor*. The second term $q(\pi_n)$ is composed of the non-diagonal part of Eq. (50) caused by the quantum nature of the probability. From the quantum-theory point of view, this term can be specified as an interference or coherence term. In decision theory, it characterizes subjective and subconscious feelings of the decision maker, and can be named the *attraction factor* [8, 19, 33, 34].

It is worth stressing that form (54) is not an assumption, but is the direct consequence of the definition for the prospect probability (52), with the prospect operator (50).

By the quantum-classical correspondence principle, when the quantum term becomes zero, the quantum probability reduces to the classical probability, so that

$$p(\pi_n) \to f(\pi_n) \; , \qquad q(\pi_n) \to 0 \; , \tag{55}$$

with the normalization

$$\sum_n f(\pi_n) = 1 \; , \qquad 0 \leq f(\pi_n) \leq 1 \; . \tag{56}$$

In quantum theory, this is called decoherence.

The attraction factor, by its construction, enjoys the following properties [8, 17, 19, 33, 34, 41]. It lies in the range

$$-1 \leq q(\pi_n) \leq 1 \tag{57}$$

and satisfies the *alternation law*

$$\sum_n q(\pi_n) = 0 \; . \tag{58}$$

This law follows immediately from the form of probability (54), under the normalization equations (53) and (56).

For a large class of distributions, there exists the *quarter law*

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} |q(\pi_n)| = \frac{1}{4} \; . \tag{59}$$

The latter allows us to use as a non-informative prior the value $|q(\pi_n)| \approx 0.25$, which makes it possible to give quantitative predictions.

Employing the definition of the conditional probability

$$p(A_n|B) = \frac{p(A_n \bigotimes B)}{p(B)} \; , \tag{60}$$

for a prospect with an uncertain event B, we have

$$p(A_n|B) = \frac{\sum_\alpha |b_\alpha|^2 p(A_n \bigotimes B_\alpha) + q(\pi_n)}{\sum_\alpha |b_\alpha|^2 p(B_\alpha) + q(B)} \; . \tag{61}$$

The use of quantum probabilities is required when the quantum term $q(\pi_n)$ is not zero. As is clear from the above consideration, the necessary condition for this is the occurrence of decisions under uncertainty. More precisely, the following theorem has been proved [27]:

Theorem. *For the quantum term $q(\pi_n)$ to be nonzero, it is necessary that the corresponding prospect π_n be entangled and also the decision-maker state $\hat{\rho}$ be entangled.*

In the case of decisions under uncertainty, the prospect probability (54) consists of two terms, utility factor and attraction factor. It is therefore possible to classify the prospects from the given lattice (51) in three ways. A prospect π_1 is more useful than π_2, if and only if $f(\pi_1) > f(\pi_2)$. A prospect π_1 is more attractive than π_2, if and only if $q(\pi_1) > q(\pi_2)$. And a prospect π_1 is preferable to π_2, if and only if $p(\pi_1) > p(\pi_2)$. In that way, a prospect can be more useful, but less attractive, as a result being less preferable, which explains all paradoxes in classical decision making [8, 19, 33, 34].

Let us stress that the principal difference of our approach in decision theory, from all other models involving quantum techniques, is the possibility to not merely qualitatively interpret empirical results, but, moreover, to give their quantitative description. As an example, let us briefly mention the prisoner dilemma game, where there are two prisoners who can either cooperate or defect (see details in Ref. [42–44]). Let C_n denote cooperation, while D_n, defection. In our terminology, there are four separable prospects: $C_1 \bigotimes C_2$, $C_1 \bigotimes D_2$, $D_1 \bigotimes C_2$, and $D_1 \bigotimes D_2$. And the aim is to study the entangled uncertain prospects

$$\pi_1 = C_1 \bigotimes \{C_2,\ D_2\} \ , \qquad \pi_2 = D_1 \bigotimes \{C_2,\ D_2\} \ ,$$

corresponding to the choice between cooperation and defection for one of the prisoners, without knowing the decision of the other one. Empirical results of experiments, accomplished by Tversky and Shafir [45], yield $p(\pi_1) = 0.37$ and $p(\pi_2) = 0.63$. In our approach, using the prior attraction factor ± 0.25, we get $p(\pi_1) = 0.35$ and $p(\pi_2) = 0.65$, which, with the given experimental accuracy, coincides with the empirical data. A detailed description of this example can be found in Refs. [27, 46].

The prospect probabilities depend on the amount of available information. This happens because the decision-maker strategic state depends on this information. Let the information measure be denoted as μ. The decision-maker states with this information and without it are respectively $\hat{\rho}(\mu)$ and $\hat{\rho}(0)$. By the Kadison [47] theorem, statistical operators, parameterized by a single parameter, are connected by means of a unitary operator $\hat{U}$ as

$$\hat{\rho}(\mu) = \hat{U}(\mu)\hat{\rho}(0)\hat{U}^{+}(\mu) \ . \tag{62}$$

The prospect probability, with information μ, is

$$p(\pi_n, \mu) = \mathrm{Tr}\hat{\rho}(\mu)\hat{P}(\pi_n) \ . \tag{63}$$

Following the above consideration, we find that this probability is generally the sum of two terms:

$$p(\pi_n, \mu) = f(\pi_n) + q(\pi_n, \mu) \ . \tag{64}$$

The first term, that is, the utility factor characterizes the prospect utility, and is not influenced by additional information, provided the utility is objectively defined. But the attraction factor, which is subjective, does depend on the available information. Employing the techniques used for treating the evolution of quantum systems [48, 49], it is possible to show [41] that the attraction factor decreases with the received additional information approximately as

$$q(\pi_n, \mu) \approx q(\pi_n, 0)e^{-\mu/\mu_c} \ , \tag{65}$$

where μ_c is the critical amount of information, after which the quantum term strongly decays.

The dependence of the attraction factor on the given information can explain the effect of *preference reversal*. This effect was noticed by Tversky and Thaler [50], who illustrated it by the following example. Imagine that people are asked to decide, under given conditions, between two programs, say A and B. It may happen that they chose B because it looks more useful. Then additional information is provided characterizing the cost of these programs. After getting this additional information, people choose A instead of B, thus, demonstrating preference reversal. This effect is closely related to the planning paradox [19]. More detailed investigation of the preference reversal will be presented in a separate paper.

5 Conclusion

We have demonstrated the main mathematical points of a theory treating on the same grounds both quantum measurements as well as quantum decision making. The quantum joint and conditional probabilities have been introduced, being valid for arbitrary events, elementary as well as composite, operationally testable, as well as inconclusive, for commutative observables, as well as for non-commuting observables. The necessity of treating decision makers as members of a society was emphasized. A pivotal point of the approach is the validity of the quantum-classical correspondence principle that provides a criterion for constructing a correct and self-consistent theory. The necessary conditions requiring the use of the quantum approach have been formulated. It was shown how additional information influences decision making. The developed Quantum Decision Theory does not meet paradoxes typical of classical decision making and, moreover, makes it possible to give quantitative predictions.

Acknowledgement

One of the authors (V.I.Y.) is grateful to E.P. Yukalova for discussions.

Funding: Financial support from the Swiss National Foundation is appreciated.

References

[1] Neumann J von. 1955 *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

[2] Neumann J von, Morgenstern O. 1953 *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

[3] Machina MJ. 2008 Non-expected utility theory. *New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*, Eds. Durlauf SN, Blume LE. New York: Macmillan.

[4] Khrennikov A. 2010 *Ubiquitous Quantum Structure*. Berlin: Springer.

[5] Busemeyer JR, Bruza P. 2012 *Quantum Models of Cognition and Decision*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[6] Bagarello F. 2013 *Quantum Dynamics for Classical Systems*. Hoboken: Wiley.

[7] Haven E, Khrennikov A. 2013 *Quantum Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[8] Yukalov VI, Sornette D. 2009 Processing information in quantum decision theory. *Entropy* **11**, 1073–1120.

[9] Sornette D. 2014 Physics and financial economics: puzzles, Ising and agent-based models. *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **77**, 062001.

[10] Ashtiani M, Azgomi MA. 2015 A survey of quantum-like approaches to decision making and cognition. *Math. Soc. Sci.* **75**, 49–80.

[11] Bohr N. 1913 On the constitution of atoms and molecules. *Phil. Mag.* **26**, 1–875.

[12] Bohr N. 1976 *Collected Works. The Correspondence Principle* vol 3. Amsterdam: North Holland.

[13] Schiff LI. 1955 *Quantum Mechanics* New York: McGraw-Hill.

[14] Zurek WH. 2003 Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origin of the classical. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 715–776.

[15] Birkhoff G, von Neumann J. 1936 The logic of quantum mechanics. *Ann. Math.* **37**, 823–843.

[16] Hughes RL. 1981 Quantum logic. *Sci. Am.* **245**, 146–157.

[17] Yukalov VI, Sornette D. 2008 Quantum decision theory as quantum theory of measurement. *Phys. Lett. A* **372**, 6867–6871.

[18] Yukalov VI, Sornette D. 2009 Scheme of thinking quantum systems. *Laser Phys. Lett.* **6**, 833–839.

[19] Yukalov VI, Sornette D. 2009 Physics of risk and uncertainty in quantum decision making. *Eur. Phys. J. B* **71**, 533–548.

[20] Yukalov VI. 2002 Stochastic instability of quasi-isolated systems. *Phys. Rev. E* **65**, 056118.

[21] Yukalov VI. 2003 Irreversibility of time for quasi-isolated systems. *Phys. Lett. A* **308**, 313–318.

[22] Gleason AM. 1957 Measures on the closed subspaces of a Hilbert space. *J. Math. Mech.* **6**, 885–893.

[23] Bogolubov NN. 1967 *Lectures on Quantum Statistics* vol 1. New York: Gordon and Breach.

[24] Bogolubov NN. 1970 *Lectures on Quantum Statistics* vol 2. New York: Gordon and Breach.

[25] Lüders G. 1951 Concerning the state change due to the measurement process. *Ann. Physik* **8**, 322–328.

[26] Wigner E. 1932 On the quantum correction for thermodynamic equilibrium. *Phys. Rev.* **40**, 749–759.

[27] Yukalov VI, Sornette D. 2013 Quantum probabilities of composite events in quantum measurements with multimode states. *Laser Phys.* **23**, 105502.

[28] Yukalov VI, Sornette D. 2014 Conditions for quantum interference in cognitive sciences. *Top. Cogn. Sci.* **6**, 79–90.

[29] Boyer-Kassem T, Duchen S, Guerci E. 2015 Testing quantum-like models of judgment for question order effects. *arXiv:1501.04901*.

[30] Kirkwood JG. 1933 Quantum statistics of almost classical assemblies. *Phys. Rev.* **44**, 31–37.

[31] Choi MD. 1972 Positive linear maps on C^*-algebras. *Can. J. Math.* **24**, 520–529.

[32] Jamiolkowski A. 1972 Linear transformations which preserve trace and positive semidefiniteness of operators. *Rep. Math. Phys.* **3**, 275–278.

[33] Yukalov VI, Sornette D. 2010 Mathematical structure of quantum decision theory. *Adv. Complex Syst.* **13**, 659–698.

[34] Yukalov VI, Sornette D. 2011 Decision theory with prospect interference and entanglement. *Theor. Decis.* **70**, 283–328.

[35] Yukalov VI, Sornette D. 2014 Self-organization in complex systems as decision making. *Adv. Complex Syst.* **17**, 1450016.

[36] Asano M, Basieva I, Khrennikov A, Ohya M, Yamato I. 2011 A general quantum information model for the contextual dependent systems breaking the classical probability law. *arXiv:1105.4769*.

[37] Yukalov VI, Sornette D. 2010 Entanglement production in quantum decision making. *Phys. At. Nucl.* **73**, 559–562.

[38] Yukalov VI, Yukalova EP, Sornette D. 2014 Quantum probabilities and entanglement for multimode quantum systems. *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **497**, 012034.

[39] Yukalov VI, Yukalova EP, Sornette D. 2013 Mode interference in quantum joint probabilities for multimode Bose-condensed systems. *Laser Phys. Lett.* **10**, 115502.

[40] Yukalov VI, Sornette D. 2015 Positive operator-valued measures in quantum decision theory. *Lecture Notes Comput. Sci.* **8951**, 146–161.

[41] Yukalov VI, Sornette D. 2014 Manipulating decision making of typical agents. *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man. Cybern. Syst.* **44**, 1155–1168.

[42] Poundstone W. 1992 *Prisoner's Dilemma*. New York: Doubleday.

[43] Weibull JW. 1995 *Evolutionary Game Theory*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

[44] Kamisnki M. 2004 *Games Prisoners Play*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

[45] Tversky A, Shafir E. 1992 The disjunction effect in choice under uncertainty. *Psychol. Sci.* **3**, 305–309.

[46] Yukalov VI, Sornette D. 2014 How brains make decisions. *Springer Proc. Phys.* **150**, 37–53.

[47] Kadison RV. 1951 Isometries of operator algebras. *Ann. Math.* **54**, 325–338.

[48] Yukalov VI. 2011 Equilibration and thermalization in finite quantum systems. *Laser Phys. Lett.* **8**, 485–507.

[49] Yukalov VI. 2012 Equilibration of quasi-isolated quantum systems. *Phys. Lett. A* **375**, 550–554.

[50] Tversky A, Thaler RH. 1990 Anomalies: preference reversals. *J. Econ. Perspect.* **4**, 201–211.